



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,534	11/30/2000	Shunichi Seki	107291	5481

25944 7590 07/16/2003
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

CLEVELAND, MICHAEL B

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1762

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s) <i>[Signature]</i>	
	09/701,534	SEKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael Cleveland	Art Unit 1762	
--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --			
<p>THE REPLY FILED 08 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.</p>			
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]			
<p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>			
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>			
<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.</p> <p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:</p>			
<p>(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p>			
<p>NOTE: <u>See attached.</u></p>			
<p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): <u>the double patenting rejections over '354 and '087.</u></p>			
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>			
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> The a)<input type="checkbox"/> affidavit, b)<input type="checkbox"/> exhibit, or c)<input type="checkbox"/> request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.</p>			
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</p>			
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered or b)<input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p>			
<p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p>			
<p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</p>			
<p>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</p>			
<p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-23.</u></p>			
<p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.</p>			
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)<input type="checkbox"/> approved or b)<input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner.</p>			
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.</p>			
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>			

Art Unit: 1762

DETAILED ACTION

1. The proposed After Final amendment will not be entered because it raises new issues for further search and consideration, such as the elimination of halogens as X in claims 6, 7, 15, 16, and 23 and the new limitation in claim 7 that at least one of the compounds is cyclic. The amendments to claims 5, 13, 14 would be entered if presented in a separate amendment.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 7/8/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Hirai does not disclose the use of an ink-jet ink, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Applicant's argument that the precursor of Hirai is not provided as a liquid because it is provided as a gas is not convincing because, as acknowledged by Applicant on p. 8, it is provided as a gas *by vaporizing the provided liquid*. Thus, Applicant has acknowledged that the precursors of Hirai are provided as liquids. Liquids are ink-jet printable.

Applicant argues that Winkler does not provide a specific example that demonstrates the synthesis of Si₆H₁₂P₂ in a liquid. The argument is unconvincing because all of the compounds of Winkler are synthesized in liquid.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant's argument that Margrave discloses fluorinated compounds is unconvincing because the proposed amendments have not been entered.

Art Unit: 1762

Applicant argues that the double patenting rejections over U.S. Patent 6,527,847 and 6,503,570 should be withdrawn because there is no common ownership. The argument is unconvincing because there is a common inventor. See MPEP 804 I.A. and Chart II-B.

3. The terminal disclaimer filed on 7/8/2003 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Patents 6,541,354 and 6,518,087 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cleveland whose telephone number is (703) 308-2331. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30 M-F, with alternate Mondays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive Beck can be reached on (703) 308-2333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 306-3186 for regular communications and (703) 306-3186 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



MBC
July 14, 2003



SHRIVE P. BECK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700